

NEGOTIATION OF MEANING IN COMMUNICATIVE TASKS

Luciana

Atma Jaya Catholic University, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

The adoption of task-based teaching in Indonesia classrooms has not been widely accepted for two major grounds. First, teachers seem to cast some doubts as to what degree such an approach can contribute to their students' language development. Second, classroom management issues, such as discipline and noise become another challenge to cope with. While these issues deserve serious attention, teachers' unwillingness to venture the use of tasks seems to put their awareness of the learning process at stake. It is through task-based teaching, students' language development can be nurtured. This study is an attempt to probe the benefits of using two types of communicative tasks: picture comparison and picture drawing. The study involving two female Taiwanese native speakers learning English found that the interactional mechanisms created through a task and, negotiation of meaning provided a potentially rich forum for students' language development. There are at least two prime elements accounting for this benefit. First, the type of direct indicators employed by the student creates linguistic urgency fostering the limit of their language capacity, and the use of embedded negotiation of meaning promotes students' active involvement. Second, one way communicative tasks, to some degree, can yield greater opportunities for students to negotiate, thus enriching acquisition.

Keywords: negotiation of meaning, communicative tasks.

INTRODUCTION

The adoption of task-based activities in big classes, a common picture in Indonesian classrooms, is often perceived with scepticism, even distrust. Not only are teachers concerned about the degree to which such tasks can yield optimal language development, but they are also worried about some aspects of class management, like noise and

discipline. While these matters deserve serious attention, what seems to be most at stake with teachers' unwillingness to venture tasks is their awareness of learners' learning processes.

Many teachers still seem to have a propensity to hold a product oriented view, putting the emphasis on language development as the product of what is taught (Ellis, 1984). On the other hand, process oriented teaching, which sheds light on the significance of the development of the internal process in learning, has not been fully taken into account. In line with SLA (Second Language Acquisition) research, it is argued that "teaching does not and cannot determine the way the learner's language will develop" (Ellis, 1985, 1994, cited in Skehan, 1996) as learners develop their own natural processes. Given this fact, a question highly pertinent to roles of teaching is how teaching can nurture this internal process. Process in second language development involves three senses as Ellis (1984) proposes: (a) the developmental process, (b) process as interaction, and (c) process as mental operation. It is particularly the second process, to which tasks based teaching can contribute.

Willis (1996: 54) argues that interaction between/among learners during the discussion of the task is a potentially rich forum evolving their language, especially their language stores (Rivers, 1987). Seedhouse (1999) refers to 'modified interaction' as crucial mechanisms promoting acquisition, while Richards and Rodgers (2002) pinpoint input and output processing, motivation, as well as negotiated and fine tuned learning difficulty as the central keys of task based teaching.

To enlighten teachers with respect to such benefits, this study discusses the degree to which the interaction created by a task can pave the way for learners' language development. Particularly, this study attempts to probe how the interaction patterns in a communicative task might contribute to learners' language development. It focuses on the role of negotiation of meaning. Two questions are addressed : (1) The extent to which negotiated meaning affects language development and (2) How different tasks affect the negotiation of meaning. Some major accounts related to input, interaction, and second language development are discussed as the basis of analysis.

INPUT, INTERACTION, AND SECOND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The extent to which interaction contributes to language development is very much dependent upon what kind of input it provides. Krashen (1980), as cited by Gass and Varonis (1985), argues

that in order for SLA to occur, learners are to be exposed to comprehensible input. It means they are to be exposed to the target language slightly higher than their level of production but at the level of their comprehension.

Long (1981) argues that the input derived from negotiated work when the learners encounter communication problems points the way to SLA. Gass (1997) adds that the negotiation involves form and meaning. Though similarly recognising the role of comprehensible input in SLA, Long (1981) differs from Krashen with respect to the way the input can be made comprehensible. Whereas Krashen (cited in Ellis *et al.*, 1994) emphasizes the role of *simplified input* and contextual support, Long (1981) highlights the role of *modified interactions*. Long (1983) identifies three strategies in negotiating meaning: (1) comprehension checks – checking whether the interlocutor has understood something, (2) confirmation checks – ensuring whether s/he has heard or understood something the interlocutor said, and (3) clarification request – requesting help in understanding something the interlocutor said.

Pica *et al.* (1987) specifically argue that modified interaction facilitates comprehension. The significance of modified interaction lies in its nature allowing the learners to actively involved in the discourse by negotiating. Stevick (1981), as cited by Gass and Varonis (1985: 150), asserts “active involvement is a necessary aspect of acquisition, since it is through involvement that the input becomes charged and penetrates deeply.”

Modified interactions are not only found in conversation between NS–NS and NS–NNS but also in that NNS–NNS. Summarizing some studies investigating NS–NNS discourse, Gass and Varonis (1985: 72) write that native speakers’ responses are characterized by greater elaboration, repetition, slower speech, more questions, more linguistic correction, and greater willingness to allow a topic shift”. This talk is referred to as ‘foreigner talk’. Varonis and Gass (1982) also indicate that foreigner talk involves the comprehensibility of the input from NNS.

In relation to NNS–NNS discourse, Gass and Varonis (1985) explain that due to the interlocutors’ shared incompetence in language, which, in turn, free them from being embarrassed to respond to other repair, their discourse “allows greater opportunity than NN–NN or NN–NS discourse for the negotiation of meaning.”

They further argue that negotiation of meaning is crucial since not only does it provide “a good forum for obtaining input necessary for acquisition” (p.83) but it also helps the interlocutors make a turn taking with full understanding equal footing (p.73). In particular, its role becomes more important when the non-understanding routines occur.

They define these routines as “those exchanges in which there is an overt indication that understanding between participants has not been complete” (p.73).

To account for the conversational episode involving these exchanges, Varonis and Gass? (1985:74-75) develop a model for the negotiation of meaning. The model represents four fundamental functions of the utterances: **T (Trigger) ---- I (Indicator) --- R (the speaker’s Response) --- RR (Reaction to the Response)**

First, (T) Trigger is the utterance on the part of the speaker, which results in some indication of non-understanding on the part of the hearer. *Second, (I) Indicator* is the one on the part of the hearer that pushes down the conversation rather than impels it forward. *Third, (R) Response* is the speaker’s response acknowledging the non-understanding in some way. Fourth, **(RR) Reaction to the response** is an optional element.

Despite the claims that interaction involving negotiation results in better comprehension that eventually facilitates SLA, Gass (1997) notes that few, however, indicate a direct link between “actual negotiation and subsequent learning” (p. 126). Some studies (Sato, 1986, 1990; Loschky, 1994; Ellis *et al.*, 1994), as cited by Gass (1997), even show that while interaction, particularly negotiation, to some extent improves comprehension, it does not directly related to SLA. Therefore, Gass (1997: 131) argues that negotiation serves as “a means of drawing attention to linguistic form, making it salient and thereby creating a readiness for learning.”

METHODOLOGY

The Tasks

This paper employs two communicative tasks involving **information exchange and information gap**. The use of two kinds of tasks is intended to see whether different tasks yield different interaction patterns in its relation to SLD.

In relation to language acquisition, Pica and Doughty (1985) argue that such tasks lead to acquisition as they involve negotiation and conversational adjustments. The first one, **picture-based comparison**, requires the participants to find similarities and differences between a set of pictures. Having had a picture, each participant is to interact by asking, describing, or clarifying to find the similarities and differences. The second one, **picture drawing**, requires one of the participants to draw a picture based on the instruction given by her partner.

In terms of the way the information is delivered, using Gass and Varonis' description (1985), these tasks can be classified into a two-way task and a one-way task. In a two-way task (picture-based comparison), both have information to share to complete the task, while in one-way task (picture drawing) only one participant has the information to give. However, in line with their explanation, the one way-task used in this paper "is not exclusively one-way but there is some exchange between the participants" (p.153).

Despite the above difference, both tasks are similar in that they make both participants heavily rely on their interaction to accomplish the tasks since they are not allowed to see each other's picture. Given the very nature of these tasks, interaction becomes an element which does not only accompany the activities but it defines the activities themselves as well.

The Participants

The participants involved in these tasks were two female Taiwanese native speakers with intermediate level of proficiency. They were master's program students majoring in International Management at the University of Leeds.

Data Collection and Procedure

The data were derived from the language interactions produced by two participants engaged in picture-based comparison and picture-drawing tasks, each of which took approximately six-minute recording. The two tasks were given in one week apart.

Having been recorded, the data were transcribed and coded for **T-I-R-RR (Trigger-Indicator-Response-Reaction to Response)** on the basis of Gass and Varonis' (1985) model of negotiation of meaning to measure its incidence of negotiation of meaning. In addition to their categories of indicators, **clarification request** to express **indicators. Is included.**

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the data from tasks, picture comparison and picture drawing reveals that negotiation of meaning is the strategy that the interlocutors used when non-understanding routines occurred. As a result of their negotiation, there is no doubt that they gained better comprehension.

However, in terms of **the quantity**, the tasks yield different numbers of negotiation of meaning. Using Gass and Varonis' (1985) model, this paper notes that out of 98 exchanges **in picture comparison**, there are only two indicators (lines 24 and 93) leading to the negotiation. On the other hand, with its fewer exchanges, **picture drawing** generates more negotiations. It displays 17 indicators from 85 exchanges (see transcript).

The two tasks are also different with respect to **the complexity** of their non-understanding routines. **Picture comparison** shows no embeddings in its non-understanding routines whereas some parts of **picture drawing** does. In other words, the latter consists of "multiple layers of trigger-resolution sequences" (Gass and Varonis, 1985) (see extract B).

Looking at the role of these negotiations in developing the learners' language, the analysis shows that the greater number of negotiation does not necessarily mean the greater degree of language development. While the only two negotiations in **picture comparison** lead to language learning (lines 25 and 94), there are four responses in **picture drawing** that do not affect the learners' language (lines 3, 5, 7, 11) (see transcript). These responses are only repeating or acknowledging the indicators. This finding might be an indication that the way the interlocutor expresses her non-understanding to some extent affects the occurrence of language development.

Gass and Varonis (1985) differentiate indicators into two types: **direct and indirect indicators**. The former "directly expresses unaccepted input, leaving no doubt that there has been a lack of understanding", whereas the latter is "a more gentle means of indicating that comprehension has in some sense been incomplete" (p.154).

The analysis of both tasks reveals that when the interlocutor indicates her non-understanding directly, using clarification request, over correction, explicit indication of non-understanding, it is more likely that language development occurs. This might be due to the nature of these indicators that gives some sort of obvious pressure to the speaker to explain. On the contrary, the use of indirect indicators, such as echoing words from the previous utterance does not seem to lead to language development.

The following extracts will illustrate some of the above analysis. Extracts A and B display how negotiation leads to language development, whereas extracts C and D show the one that does not.

Picture comparison
Extract A: line 22-27

22. B: and this person also has a kettle and the heater *ok?*

Comprehension

23. A: yeah but it's not a regular kettle, *old one*

24. B: *what do you mean by old one?*

clarification

25. A: *it look like made in made in is is iron*

26. B: ah *iron made of iron* like the one we use in Taiwan

structure

27. A: yeah yeah yeah *made of iron* like in Taiwan

check

T

I--

request

R—giving

example

RR—

correction

By saying *ok*, **B** ensures that A understands **the kettle and the heater** she is talking about. **A** shows her understanding by responding affirmatively. However, **A's** expansion of the word *kettle*, the old one serves as a **trigger**. **B** indicates by requesting further explanation, to which **A** responds with the material of that kettle. **B** reacts by giving an example. From this episode, it is apparent that through the negotiation of the meaning of **old one**, **B** grasps the idea that it refers to the old model of kettle, not to the condition. In addition to **B's** comprehension, **A's** and **B's** negotiated work results in **A's semantic modification of the old one** through giving the example of the material of the kettle (line25) and **correction** of the use of the preposition (line 27). In other words, **A** is likely to learn to develop her language.

Picture drawing

Extract B: line 5-14

5. A: okay number two a big face, big nose, small eyes...
and smile left, ya I mean *left*

6. B: *left?* (stop drawing)
with

7. A: *yeah left hm hm*

8. B: *I don't understand what you mean left?*
non-

T

I – echoing

raising

intonation/

confirmation

check

R/T—

acknowledge

ment/

repetition

RR/I-explicit

understandin

g

clarification

request

9. A: I mean hm hm I mean <i>you draw face in ...</i> <i>to left</i> expansion	R/T----
10.B: <i>draw face to left?</i> with	I—echoing rising intonation confirmation check
11.A: <i>ya to left</i> acknowledgement/ and with <i>a hat</i>	R- repetition T
12.B: <i>what kind of hat?</i> clarification	I — request
13.A: ehm ehm like ehm <i>cowboy ya cowboy hat</i> expansion	R —
14.B: ah ya ya showing	RR--- understandi ng

Extract B illustrates **some embeddings** in the negotiation. **A's** instruction in line 5 (left) brings about non-understanding that is indicated by **B'** echoing the utterance with rising intonation. Capturing **B's** confusion, unfortunately **A** just repeats her utterance. As a result, her response serves as a trigger. This pushes **B** to explicitly indicates her non-understanding by saying 'I don't understand what you mean left'. **B** demands **A** to give overt explanation. Being indicated twice that her utterances raise some problems, **A** eventually expands her instruction 'I mean you draw face in....to left'. However, once again it seems that **A's** response does not completely help **B** since she is still echoing with rising intonation 'draw face to left?', signalling her incomplete comprehension. This time, **A** acknowledges (ya) and repeats the first instruction (left) and quickly proceeds with another one. This signals her readiness to continue the talk and end the negotiation. In fact, **B** realizes this and moves to the clarification request of the kind of hat. **A** responds by expanding the detail of the hat. **A's language** expansion can serve as a clue of her language development.

In this case, the interaction displays two interesting aspects of negotiation of meaning. When it is done through a single layer of trigger-resolution sequence (T-I-R) (lines 5-7), which only provides

acknowledgement and repetition as responses (line 7), it does not seem to lead to **A's** language development. However, it does when the negotiation involves embedded non-understanding routines (lines 7-8) which to a great degree might give some pressure to the speaker to explain.

Picture drawing

Extract C: line 4-5

4. B: oh r round?

I – echoing by rising

intonation

5. A: yeah round and

R – acknowledging and

repeating

Extract D: line 32-33

32. B: he looks angry?

I – echoing by raising

intonation

33. A: ya

R – acknowledging

Extract C shows that **B's** signalling her incomplete comprehension does not lead to **A's** modifying her response as it is seen above she just acknowledges and repeats **B's** indicator. Similarly, in extract D, **A** just responds 'ya' to **B's** indicator. The use of direct indicators leading to language development marks the similarity of the patterns of negotiating meaning on both tasks.

The data discussed suggest that interaction involving negotiation of meaning can lead to language development. Supporting this, Pica (1987) asserts that assisting learners to gain comprehension and allowing them to manipulate L2 form through negotiation of meaning have an important role for SLA. However, the degree to which it ensures the occurrence of language development is not as high as its role in assisting comprehension. On the basis of the analysed data, this paper predicts that the way the interlocutor initiates the negotiation might account for this. Using Gass and Varonis' (1985) classification of indicators, it seems that direct indicators to some extent can maximize the urgency of the speaker's further explanation, which in turn creates some sort of pressure for the speaker to go beyond his/her previous linguistic utterance. This eventually points the way to the learner's language development. On the other hand, the indirect ones might not reflect the urgency for the speaker's explanation. For example, the speaker might interpret the recipient's echoing with rising or falling intonation as an indication of confirmation, resulting in only his/her acknowledgement or repetition. Extending this explanation, this paper suggests that active involvement of the learners to pursue the information is another crucial variable to language development. This is because as Stevick (1981), as cited by Gass and Varonis (1985: 150),

states “It is through involvement that the input becomes charged and penetrates deeply.”

Foster (1998: 20) argues that due to the nature of communicative tasks, particularly those used in research, which tends “to focus on meaning rather than form, they do not encourage students to reflect openly on the language they are producing.” Slightly different from this argument, the analysis finds that the communicative tasks used for these data, to some extent, can lead the interlocutors to pay attention to their language forms through their negotiation of meaning. This is, for example, reflected in line 26 (picture comparison) and line 43, 71 (picture drawing) (see transcript).

With regard to the effects of the type of tasks involved, the data analysed point out that two-way task yields fewer numbers negotiation of meaning than one-way task. This is different from Long’s claim (1983) that two-way tasks generate a greater amount of modified interaction. What might account for this discrepancy, as Gass and Varonis (1985) write, are shared assumptions. They further explain that there is an inverse relationship between instances of indicators and the amount of shared background. The greater the shared set of assumptions, the less the need for negotiation (p.159).

In line with their argument, this paper finds that picture drawing yields less amount of negotiation as is indicated by its indicators since both participants have shared background of the task by looking at the picture. On the contrary, one-way tasks might encourage the recipient to be more active in seeking the information. This is logical, as Gass and Varonis (1985) point out, that she is the one who has the most urgent need to gain comprehension. Different from this view, Pica (1987) argues that information gap activities in which one participant holds all information and the other must work to elicit it have a danger that can lead to ‘unequal role relationship.’ However, by viewing that both parties have responsibility to provide information and seek it, that danger can be avoided.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Despite the fact that negotiation of meaning does not automatically lead to language development, this paper highlights that it can be a potential forum for language development. There are at least two qualities of negotiation of meaning accounting for this. The first concerns the type of indicators the learners used to signal their incomplete comprehension. By using direct indicators, the learners create linguistic urgency,

pushing their partner to further develop the language. The second is related to the learners' active involvement, which can be supported through the use of embedded negotiation of meaning.

Closely linked to the role of negotiation of meaning in language development is the type of the tasks. One-way tasks to some extent can provide greater opportunities for learners to negotiate than two-way tasks.

Bringing the above ideas within the classroom framework, this paper provides some insights for teaching. First, it is necessary for the teachers to use communicative activities promoting negotiation of meaning that support comprehensible input and output. Second, not only is it through tasks the teachers can encourage interaction involving negotiation of meaning, but also through their own teaching. Third, in the light of communicative teaching trend where group work or pair work is regarded beneficial for language development, the teachers should take into consideration how they group or pair the learners. This is related to the input the learners gain. It is suggested that they are mixed; for example, the high level with the intermediate one.

REFERENCES

- Ellis, R. 1984. *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Ellis, R, Y. Tanaka, & A. Yamazaki. 1994. Classroom interaction, comprehension, and the acquisition of L2 word meanings. *Language learning* 44/3, 449-491.

- Foster, P. 1998. A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied linguistics* 19/ 1, 1-23.
- Gass, S.M. 1997. *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S.M. & E.M Varonis. 1985. Task variation and nonnative/nonnative negotiation of meaning. In S.M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.) *Input in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.
- Long, M.H. 1981. Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In Harris Winitz (Ed.) *Native language and foreign language acquisition*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. Volume 379.
- Long, M.H. 1983a. Native speaker/nonnative speaker conversation and the Negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied linguistics* 4, 126-41.
- Long, M.H. 1983b. Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in second language acquisition* 5/2, 177-193.
- Pica, T. 1987. Second language acquisition, social interaction and the Classroom. *Applied linguistics* 8/1, 3-21.
- Pica, T. 1994. Research on negotiation: what does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes and outcomes? *Language learning* 44/3, 493-527.
- Pica, T. & C. Doughty. 1985. The role of groupwork in classroom second language acquisition. *Studies in second language acquisition* 7/2.
- Pica, T., R. Young, & C. Doughty. 1987. The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly* 21/4, 737-758.
- Richards, J.C. & T.S. Rodgers. 2002. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. 1987. *Interaction language teaching*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. 1999. Task-based interaction. *ELT Journal* 53/3, 149-155.
- Skehan, P. 1996. Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In Jane Willis & Dave Willis (Eds.) *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.

- Varonis, E.M. and S. Gass. 1982. The comprehensibility of non-native speech. *Studies in second language acquisition* 4/2, 115-134.
- Varonis, E.M. & S. Gass. 1985. Non-native/non-native conversations: a model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied linguistics* 6, 71-89.
- Willis, J. 1996. A flexible framework for task-based learning. In Jane Willis & Dave Willis (Eds.) *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.

APPENDIX

I. Transcription: Picture differences

1. A : there are four folder on the shelf ... picture
 2. B : yeah yeah
 3. A : and five piece of papers on the typewriter
 4. B : ehmm yeah
 5. A : and also there is black telephone under the desk
 6. B : yeah next to the typewriter
 7. A : yeah in my picture there are two arrows in the target on the door
 8. B : yeah ah, ya ya ya I saw it ya
 9. A : in my picture there are two arrows
 10. B : yeah ha?
yeah two arrows
 11. A : and and
 12. B : I think is that is there two sandwiches on the desk beside the typewriter and one
has been bite
 13. A : yeah yeah
there are banana
 14. B : yeah skin
 15. A : yeah skin
there is a book under the desk
 16. B : yeah at the at the left side
 17. A : yeah
 18. B : and the drawer is
 19. A : open
 20. B : yeah and the paper I think is not
 21. A : is not ha ha ha
 22. B : and this person also has a kettle and the heater *ok?*
 23. A : yeah but it's not a regular kettle, *old one*
 24. B : *what do you mean by old one?*
 25. A : *it look like made in made in is is iron*
 26. B : ah iron *made of iron*
- | |
|-------------------------|
| Comprehension check |
| T |
| I—clarification request |
| R—explanation |
| RR—structure |
- correction
- like the one we use in Taiwan
27. A : yeah yeah yeah *made of iron* like in Taiwan
 28. B : I know
 29. A : there is a pencil on the chair
 30. B : on the chair?
no my is on the desk just between between
 31. A : typewriter and kettle
 32. B : yeah
 33. A : there is one as well but I have another one on the chair
 34. B : oh yeah but I didn't
and there is a picture on my right hand side what is this?
 35. A : like a small table or something
 36. B : yeah yeah
 37. A : yeah yeah
 38. B : with a car old car
 39. A : ya ya

40. B : and there is a cup and the...
41. A : coffee flow
42. B : ya and the plate the dish used for cigarette
43. A : the dish used for cigarette
44. B : ya and the next to the next to the desk there is a trash can
45. A : ya
46. B : and the trash flow out
47. A : flow out and there is a clock on the floor
48. B : ya ya
49. A : it's a bird
50. B : throw out (*laughing*)
51. A : ya (*laughing*) and the time is seven o'clock
52. B : no it's... mine is nine o'clock I think yeah
53. A : mine is seven
54. B : and there is ...ehm a ring bell on the floor as well
55. A : oh ya there is a ring bell
56. And next the window... ehm ehm there's a plant with three leaves
57. B : ha ha but it is not it's not...grows very well
58. A : it seems going to die
59. B : maybe and there's there's bottles on the floor
60. A : yeah one is fall down
61. B : yeah and and there a can on the wall as well
Just ehm ehm above the desk
62. A : ya under the shelves
63. B : yeah under the shelf
and the ehm next to the can at the can at right side I think it's a postcard
64. A : I think it's a postcard
65. B : yeah and left hand side I think it's a picture
66. A : yeah maybe
67. B : It's a photo
68. A : It's a photo with four picture
69. B : yeah yeah and the oh next to the folders
Could you see there a cup?
70. A : yeah broken
71. B : yeah broken one with two lines
72. A : yeah yeah
73. B : so I think maybe everything is the same
74. A : what's the difference?
oh there is a carpet under the chair
75. B : yeah yeah
76. A : and with one two three four five five lines
on the carpet not very clear
77. B : yeah yeah
78. A : and do you know something with the line we made the sweater?
It's under put under the floor
79. B : yeah I saw it as well
I think this person might have a...
80. A : a dog
81. B : because he got a bell
82. A : a belt a dog belt
83. B : just at the left hand side of the desk

84. A : yeah and the I think this house is quite out of the wall paper
It's not quite stick to the wall
and you see just ..around around the door
the wall paper is not stick sticky to door
85. A : I can't find in my picture
86. B : and the window the glasses has been broken
87. A : oh no not mine
and the the draw I mean under the kettle there's a shelf above the shelf the
draw is
88. B : the drawer is open
89. A : yeah the first one
90. B : yeah the same
and the and the curtain cover the half of the window
91. A : yeah maybe
92. B : maybe so
93. A : *under on the wall next to the bottom bottom bottoms* T
: *bottoms?* I—echoing with rising intonation
94. B : *just under the shelf under the which put the plant* R/T
95. A : *oh you mean near the floor?* RR/I—clarification
request
96. B : *yeah near the floor* R—acknowledgement
repetition
97. A : yeah maybe but I don't think this picture is very clear I can't find
98. B : that's okay

II. Transcription: Picture drawing

1. A : *number one a round big face with a big nose a face* T
2. B : *is the face big? big face, ya?* I—confirmation check
3. A : *ya* R—acknowledgement
4. B : *oh r round?* I—confirmation check
5. A : *yeah round and big nose, small eyes, smile and short hair ya* R—acknowledgement
and repetition
- okay number two a big face, big nose, small eyes and smile
6. B : *left ya I mean left* T
: *left?* I—echoing with rising intonation/confirmation check
7. A : *yeah left hm hm* R/T—acknowledgement and repetition
8. B : I don't understand RR/I—explicit indication
nonunderstanding
Clarification request
9. A : I mean hm hm I mean you draw face in to left R/T— expansion
10. B : draw face to left? I—echoing with rising intonation
confirmation check
11. A : ya to left R—acknowledgement
repetition

	and with a <i>hat</i>	
12.B	: <i>what kind of hat?</i>	T
13.A	: ehm ehm like ehm <i>cowboy ya cowboy hat</i>	I—clarification request
14.B	: ah ah ya ya	R—expansion
		RR—showing understanding
15.A	: number three is the <i>woman</i>	T
16.B	: <i>woman?</i>	I—echoing with rising intonation
		confirmation check
17.A	: <i>ya</i>	R—acknowledgement
18.B	: <i>what kind of woman?</i>	I—clarification request
19.A	: eh, round face, rr face, big nose, <i>smile, smile eyes</i>	R/T
20.B	: <i>smile eyes?</i>	I—echoing with rising intonation
		confirmation check
21.A	: <i>small eyes</i> ehm and without ehm not very long but <i>cute</i>	R/T—correction
22.B	: <i>cute? no but curl</i>	
		I—echoing with rising intonation
23.A	: <i>curl? curl hair</i>	self correction
24.B	: eh just face?	R—expansion
25.A	: ya just face	
26.B	: big nose, small eyes, smile, curl hair, very curl?	
27.A	: not not very curl	
28.B	: okay ya	
29.A	: number four a a man ehm big face, big nose	
30.B	: another big face and big nose?	
31.A	: ya ya all will be face, big nose, looks angry he looks angry	
32.B	: he looks angry	
33.A	: ya	
34.B	: ah ya ya	
35.A	: and without hair without hair no hair	
36.B	: I know this not hair	
37.A	: okay number five a man still small eyes, big nose	
38.B	: wait wait wait	
39.A	: smile smile	
40.B	: smile	
41.A	: and without glasses and small, curl short hair ya ya short number six ehm a man small eyes, big nose, smile and with ear	T
42.B	: <i>with ear?</i>	I—echoing with rising intonation
		confirmation check
43.A	: <i>a pair of ears</i> (laughing)	R—expansion
44.B	: okay	RR
45.A	: and ehm it's it's a <i>regular</i> man's hair	T

46.B	: <i>what's regular?</i>	I—clarification request
47.A	: in chinese we use they suit if somebody wear a <i>suit</i>	R/T—giving example
48. B with	: a suit?	RR/I—echoing
		rising intonation
		/clarification request
49.A	: <i>I mean I mean when they wear suit ehm the hair</i> expansion	R--
50.B	: hair model	RR
51.A	: ya hair model the style	
52.B	: ah ya ya ya (<i>showing understanding</i>) It's kind of (inaudible) wait like that?	
53.A	: ya okay Seven	
54.B	: ehm	
55.A	: big nose, small eyes, smile	
56.B	: big nose, small eyes, smile (<i>repeating softly</i>)	
57.A	: and with a hat hat hat	
58.B	: ya	
59.A	: and ya	
60.B	: the same as number two?	
61.A	: ya like number two but the hair the hand with a flower but it's a man I know it's a man because (.) (.) he has ehm what's that shirt?	
62.B	: a a ah (<i>showing understanding</i>)	
63.A	: ya but the head with a flower	
64.B	: ya many flowers?	
65.A	: no just one okay number eight a big face, big nose, small eyes, smile without hair smile and he bite a flower he he	
66.B	: ya?	
67.A	: like <i>Spain the woman dance</i>	T
68.B	: <i>the Spanish woman dance?</i>	I—echoing
69.A	: <i>ya</i> acknowledgement	R--
	and the flower is on ehm the flower is on <i>her face</i>	T
70.B	: <i>her face a woman?</i>	I--echoing
71.A	: no a man oh ya his his face <i>the flower on his face</i>	R/T--expansion
72. B	: <i>on his face?</i>	I -- echoing with rising intonation/ confirmation check
73.A	: I mean he he bite the flower	R
74.B	: ah ya ya	RR
75.A	: right side <i>right</i> side	T

76.B : *the flower on the right?*
echoing/confirmation

I—

77.A : *ya*
number nine the man's face
78.B : eh wait

check
R--acknowledgement

79.A : no no (*she saw her partner started drawing a round face*)
the man's face is triangle (*tringel*) (*traigel*)
80.B : triangle (*correcting her partner's pronunciation*)
81.A : face shape shape of face
82.B : is it triangle?
83.A : ehm eh so triangle
big nose, small eyes (.) (.) with hair but like a mess
you know the hair like mess
84.B : ya ya
85.A : ya and a pair of ears.